

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant appreciates the consideration shown by the Office, as evidenced by the Office Action mailed on 21 March 2005. In that Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-9, 11-16, 18-24, and 26-30 under 35 USC 103(a) on Limousin US6938242 in view of Higgins et al. US6397202 (hereinafter Higgins), and rejected claims 2, 10, 17, and 25 under Limousin in view of Higgins and further in view of Martin et al., March 1987 "A Project Accountability Chart (PAC)," Journal of Systems Management.

Applicant has added new claims 31-36. Claims 1-36 are under consideration in the present application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application by the Examiner in light of the following remarks offered in response to the Office Action.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1, 3-9, 11-16, 18-24, and 26-30 under 35 USC 103(a) over Limousin and Higgins. Applicant respectfully submits that Limousin and Higgins do not either individually or in combination disclose, teach, or suggest the claim 1, 9, 16, or 24 recitations of (with emphasis added).

1. A computerized method for accessing and displaying project risk management information, the method comprising:  
creating a plurality of **issues and risks** using a globally-accessible system; and  
**monitoring and tracking the plurality of issues and risks** via the globally-accessible system using a plurality of color-coded visual displays graphically **indicating favorable or unfavorable process progress** over time.

9. A computerized method for accessing and displaying project risk management information, the method comprising:  
creating a plurality of **issues and risks** using a globally-accessible system;  
monitoring and tracking the plurality of issues and risks via the globally-accessible system using a plurality of color-coded visual displays graphically indicating **favorable or unfavorable process progress** over time; and  
wherein the globally-accessible system may be accessed by a plurality of remote users simultaneously.

16. A computerized system for accessing and displaying project risk management information, the system comprising:  
an issue management module operable for creating, storing, and graphically displaying the status of a **plurality of issues**;  
a risk management module operable for creating, storing, and graphically displaying the status of a **plurality of risks**;  
a plurality of color-coded visual displays for **graphically displaying the status of the plurality of issues and risks**;  
a processor operable for manipulating information related to the plurality of issues and risks; and  
a communications network operable for **communicating information related to the plurality of issues and risks** to and from a plurality of remote users.

24. A computerized system for accessing and displaying project risk management information, the system comprising:  
an issue management module operable for creating, storing, and graphically displaying the status of a **plurality of issues**;  
a risk management module operable for creating, storing, and graphically displaying the status of a **plurality of risks**;  
a plurality of color-coded visual displays for **graphically displaying the status of the plurality**

**of issues and risks;**

a processor operable for manipulating information related to the plurality of issues and risks; and  
a communications network operable for **communicating information related to the plurality of issues and risks** to and from a plurality of remote users simultaneously.

Applicant traverses the portions of page 2 of the Office Action which imply that an "issue" is another word for "task." Limousin appears to relate to **planning equipment installation** (see, for example the abstract and column 1, lines 50-56). Applicant could not find any references to "risks" or "issues" in Limousin. All of the tracking appears to be directed to planning of installation **tasks**. Tasks are typically activities in a project that must be performed over a fixed time interval. The bars referenced in the cited column 10, lines 31-40 of Limousin do not appear to relate to issues or risks but instead appear to relate to a Gantt chart including tasks to be completed.

Higgins does not overcome the above noted deficiencies of Limousin. Higgins appears to relate to quantification of risks or risk levels that may arise on a project as well as overall project risk (column 3, lines 1-10, and abstract). More specific types of risk are described with respect to FIG. 3 and column 5, line 50, through column 6, line 8 (source lines of code, systems requirements, staffing level, and total). Applicant traverses the implication on page 3 of the Office Action that the cited column means that "problems = issues" or any implication that issues are monitored and tracked in either of the cited references.

Accordingly, because no combination of the applied references teaches or suggests the claimed language, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, claims 3-8 which depend therefrom, claim 9, claims 11-15 which depend therefrom, claim 16, claims 18-23 which depend therefrom, claim 24, and claims 26-30 which depend therefrom define allowable subject matter over the applied art. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested, and allowance of claims 1, 3-9, 11-16, 18-24, and 26-30 is respectfully solicited.

Claims 2, 10, 17, and 25 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) on Limousin and Higgins in view of Martin. Claims 2, 10, 17, and 25 respectively depend from independent claims 1, 9, 16, and 24, each of which Applicant believes to be in condition for allowance over Limousin and Higgins for the reasons discussed above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 10, 17, and 25 define allowable subject matter over Limousin, Higgins, and Martin.

Furthermore, Applicant continues to traverse the statement that Martin discloses a risk probability number. Applicant cannot find a specific reference to "risk probability number" in Martin and traverses the office action assertion that an indication of percent of activity of completion is a "risk probability number." An RPN (risk probability number – sometimes referenced in literature as a risk priority number) is a specific term defined within failure mechanisms and effects analysis (FMEA) as a combination of the frequency of an occurrence multiplied by its severity. During a quick search on the Internet, Applicant found one such example at <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/regs/nonroad/equip-ld/phase3/420r06006-rpt-2appdx.pdf> on pages 105 (a copy of which is attached hereto) which cites and summarizes SAE J1739. An RPN is not at all the same as a "probability of accomplishment" number as alluded to on page 9 of the Office Action. More specifically, such probability of accomplishment numbers relate to tasks and not to risks or issues.

Appl. No. 09/882,639  
Amdt. Dated 2 June 2006  
Reply to Office action of 21 March 2005

Applicant has added new claims 31-33 which depend from claim 1 and new claims 34-36 which depend from claim 16. Support can be found, for example, in paragraph 12 of Applicant's specification. Each of these claims is believed to be in condition for allowance based on the above discussion of the independent claims and for the recitations separately recited therein.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is needed to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Ann M. Agosti/  
Ann M. Agosti  
Reg. No. 37,372  
General Electric Company  
Building K1, Room 3A66  
One Research Circle  
Niskayuna, New York 12309  
Telephone: (518) 387-7713